

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#3 Local FIPS Code	64 ¹ 6 ²	0 0	0 0	0 0	
#5 Most Recent Periodic Review Date	54 2	7 4	1 0	2 0	<p>In two of the agency cases, the AFCARS response was blank. The child had been in care for more than a year, and the reviewers found a review date.</p> <p>In one error case, the child had been in care for nine months and this field was blank. The reviewer found a review date prior to nine months.</p> <p>In one error case, the reviewer found a review date that was a month later than the one reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In one error case, the AFCARS file was blank. The reviewer did find a review date.</p> <p>In one error case, the reviewer found a more recent date. The one reported was a year old.</p>

¹ Child Welfare Agency Cases (Agency)

² Tribal Child Welfare Cases (Tribal)

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					<p>In one error case, the date reported was after the end of the report period. The date reported was June 2006 and the child discharged in January 2006.</p> <p>The questionable case had 3/31/06 reported in AFCRS, but the reviewer noted the last review was 10/11/05. It was not clear if this was one of the cases in which the next scheduled review date was reported.</p> <p>In three of the Tribal error cases, the data was missing but the reviewers found a current review date.</p> <p>In one Tribal case, the date found by the reviewer was later than the one reported to AFCARS.</p>
#6 Child Birth Date	64 6	0 0	0 0	0 0	
#7 Child Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	64 6	0 0	0 0	0 0	
#8 Child Race	63	0	0	1	
a. American Indian or	6	0	0	0	

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 71
Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
Alaska Native					
b. Asian	63 6	0 0	0 0	1 0	
c. Black or African American	62 6	1 0	0 0	1 0	The error case was an additional race identified by the reviewer.
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	63 6	0 0	0 0	1 0	
e. White	63 6	0 0	0 0	1 0	
f. Unable to Determine	63 6	0 0	0 0	1 0	
#9 Child Hispanic Origin 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	60 6	3 0	0 0	1 0	In two error cases, the AFCARS indicated “unable to determine,” but the reviewer found the child was not of Hispanic origin.
#10 Has Child Been Diagnosed with Disability?	51 4	12 2	0 0	1 0	In one error case, the AFCARS data indicated “not yet determined,” but the reviewer found that the child did have a disability. The child had been in care for a year and a half. In two of the agency error cases, the AFCARS indicated “not yet determined,” and the reviewer found the response to be “no.”

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					<p>In eight of the agency cases, the AFCARS data indicated “no,” but the reviewers found a diagnosed condition.</p> <p>In one error case, the AFCARS report indicated “yes,” but the response should have been “no.” In this case, elements #11-15 were blank.</p> <p>In the Tribal error cases, the AFCARS indicated “not yet determined,” but the reviewers noted the response should have been “no.” In both instances, the child had been in care for more than a year.</p>
#11 Mental Retardation	49 5	12 1	1 0	2 0	<p>In seven error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p>In one error case, the AFCARS file was blank, but the reviewer found that this category applied.</p> <p>In four error cases, the response for elements #11 -15 was blank, but the answer in element #10 was reported as “yes.” In two of these cases, the</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					<p>reviewer found that this condition should have been “applies.”</p> <p>In the Tribal error case, elements #11 through 15 were blank, even though the response to element #10 was “yes.”</p>
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	58 5	5 1	1 0	0 0	<p>In the five agency error cases, the response for elements #11 -15 was blank, but the answer in element #10 was reported as “yes.” In all of these cases, the reviewer found that this condition should have been “does not apply.”</p> <p>In the Tribal error case, elements #11 through 15 were blank, even though the response to element #10 was “yes.”</p>
#13 Physically Disabled	59 5	5 1	0 0	0 0	<p>In five error cases, the response for elements #11 -15 was blank, but the answer in element #10 was reported as “yes.” In all of these cases, the reviewer found that this condition should have been “does not apply.”</p> <p>In the Tribal error case, elements #11 – 15 were blank, even though the</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	48 5	14 1	1 0	1 0	<p>response to element #10 was “yes.”</p> <p>In one error case, the AFCARS file was blank, but the reviewer found that this category applied.</p> <p>In four error cases, the response for elements #11 -15 was blank, but the answer in element #10 was reported as “yes.” In all of these cases, the reviewer found that this condition should have been “applies.”</p> <p>In nine error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p>In the Tribal error case, elements #11 – 15 were blank, even though the response to element #10 was “yes.”</p>
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	48 5	15 1	1 0	0 0	<p>In six error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p>In five of the agency error cases, the response was “does not apply” instead of “applies.” These were errors between element #14 and #15 that</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					<p>were due to miscoding.</p> <p>In four error cases, the response for elements #11 -15 was blank, but the answer in element #10 was reported as “yes.” In all of these cases, the reviewer found that this condition should have been “does not apply.”</p> <p>In the Tribal error case, elements #11 through 15 were blank, even though the response to element #10 was “yes.” Element #15 should have been “applies.”</p>
<p>#16 Has Child Ever Been Adopted?</p> <p>1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine</p>	<p>60 5</p>	<p>4 1</p>	<p>0 0</p>	<p>0 0</p>	<p>In two error cases, the response should have been “no” instead of “unable to determine.”</p> <p>In one error case, the response should have been “yes” instead of “no.”</p> <p>In one error case, the response was “no” instead of “yes.”</p> <p>In the Tribal error case, the AFCARS data indicated “unable to determine,” but the reviewer found that the child had not been previously adopted.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#17 Age at Previous Adoption 0 = Not Applicable 1 = less than 2 years old 2 = 2-5 years old 3 = 6-12 years old 4 = 13 years or older 5 = Unable to Determine	59 5	5 1	0 0	0 0	In two error cases, the response should have been “not applicable” instead of “unable to determine.” In one error case, an age was reported and the response should have been “not applicable.” In one error case, the AFCARS data indicate the child’s age at the time of the adoption was “less than 2 years old.” The child was actually eleven years old. In one agency error case, the AFCARS response was “6-12 years old,” and it should have been “not applicable.” In the Tribal error case, the response should have been “not applicable” instead of “unable to determine.”
#18 Date of First Removal from Home	51 4	9 1	1 0	3 1	In four error case, the reviewer found an earlier date than the one reported to AFCARS (pre-conversion). In one error case, elements #18 and #21 had different dates of removal but

Number of cases in sample: 80
 Number of cases reviewed: 71
 Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					<p>the AFCARS file indicated only one removal in element #19 and no date of discharge for element #20.</p> <p>In one error case, the date reported was the date the State received legal custody but the child was in a hospital. The actual removal date for AFCARS reporting was five days later.</p> <p>In one agency error case, the reviewer found a later date than the one reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In the Tribal error case, an earlier date was found.</p>
#19 Total Number of Removals from Home	46 5	12 0	3 0	3 1	<p>In eleven of the agency error cases, the reviewers found more removal episodes than what was reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In one error case, elements #18 and #21 had different dates of removal but the AFCARS file indicated only one removal in element #19 and no date of discharge for element #20.</p>
#20 Date of Discharge	43	14	3	4	In eleven of the error cases, a date

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 71
Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
from Previous Episode	5	0	0	1	<p>should have been reported because there were two or more removals.</p> <p>In two error cases, the reviewer found a later discharge date than the one reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In one error case, elements #18 and #21 had different dates of removal but the AFCARS file indicated only one removal in element #19 and no date of discharge for element #20.</p>
#21 Date of Latest Removal	53 5	10 1	0 0	1 0	<p>In one error case, the reviewer found an earlier date than the one reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In four error cases, the reviewer found later dates than the one reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In three agency error cases, the reviewers found later dates than what was reported to AFCARS due to earlier removal episodes that were not counted.</p> <p>In one error case, the date of removal was actually later than what was</p>

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 71
Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					<p>reported. The date reported was when the State had “protective supervision” and the child had not been placed into foster care.</p> <p>In one error case, elements #18 and #21 had different dates of removal but the AFCARS file indicated only one removal in element #19 and no date of discharge for element #20.</p> <p>In the Tribal error case, an earlier date was found.</p>
#23 Date of Placement in Current Setting	46 5	9 0	0 0	9 1	<p>In four of the agency error case, the reviewer found a later date than what was reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In one agency error case, the reviewer found a later date than what was reported.</p> <p>In four error cases, the date was wrong because the reviewer found an additional placement after the one reported.</p>
#24 Number of Previous Placement Settings in This	36 2	15 2	3 0	10 2	<p>In eleven error cases, there were more placements than what was reported to AFCARS.</p>

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 71
Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
Episode					In four error cases, there were fewer placements. In the two Tribal error cases, the reviewers found more placements than what was reported in AFCARS.
#25 Manner of Removal From Home for This Episode 1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined	64 6	0 0	0 0	0 0	
#26 Physical Abuse	59 6	4 0	0 0	1 0	In three error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”
#27 Sexual Abuse	61 6	2 0	0 0	1 0	In two error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#28 Neglect	55 6	8 0	0 0	1 0	In the error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#29 Parent Alcohol Abuse	51	12	0	1	In the error cases, the response should

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
	4	2	0	0	<p>have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p>In the two Tribal error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>
#30 Parent Drug Abuse	55 4	8 2	0 0	1 0	<p>In seven error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p>In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”</p> <p>In the two Tribal error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>
#31 Child Alcohol Abuse	53 5	10 1	0 0	1 0	<p>In six error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p>In four error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”</p> <p>In the Tribal error case, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#32 Child Drug Abuse	62 6	1 0	0 0	1 0	In one error case, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#33 Child Disability	59 6	4 0	0 0	1 0	In four error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#34 Child’s Behavior Problem	61 6	2 0	0 0	1 0	In the error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#35 Death of Parent	62 6	1 0	0 0	1 0	In one error case, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#36 Incarceration of Parent	60 6	3 0	0 0	1 0	In two error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”
#37 Caretaker Inability to Cope	61 5	2 1	0 0	1 0	In two error case, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In the Tribal error case, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#38 Abandonment	58 6	5 0	0 0	1 0	In four error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 71
Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					“does not apply.” In one error case, the response should have been “does not apply” instead of “applies.”
#39 Relinquishment	60 6	3 0	0 0	1 0	In three error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#40 Inadequate Housing	59 5	4 1	0 0	1 0	In the error cases, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.” In the Tribal error case, the response should have been “applies” instead of “does not apply.”
#41 Current Placement Setting 1 = Pre-Adoptive Home 2 = Foster Family Home (Relative) 3 = Foster Family Home (Non-Relative) 4 = Group Home 5 = Institution 6 = Supervised Independent Living 7 = Runaway	55 4	8 2	1 0	0 0	In one error case the living arrangement was “non-relative foster home” instead of “institution.” In two error cases, the living arrangement was “group home” instead of “institution.” In one error case, the living arrangement was “runaway” instead of “institution.” In one error case, the living

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 71
Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
8 = Trial Home Visit					<p>arrangement was a “trial home visit” instead of “relative foster home.”</p> <p>In one error case, the living arrangement was a “trial home visit” instead of “non-relative foster home.”</p> <p>In one error case, the living arrangement was “group home” instead of “non-relative foster home.”</p> <p>In one error case, the living arrangement was “foster home, relative” instead of “non-relative foster home.”</p> <p>The questionable case is due to the AFCARS indicating “relative foster home,” but the reviewer noted “kinship.”</p> <p>In one Tribal error case, the response should have been “group home” instead of “foster family home, non-relative.” In this case, element #49 was correctly reported as blank.</p>

Number of cases in sample: 80
 Number of cases reviewed: 71
 Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					In the other Tribal error case, the living arrangement was “foster family home, relative” instead of “foster family home, non-relative.”
#42 Out of State Placement	64 6	0 0	0 0	0 0	
#43 Most Recent Case Plan Goal 1 = Reunify with Parent(s) or Principal Caretaker(s) 2 = Live with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Long Term Foster Care 5 = Emancipation 6 = Guardianship 7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established	60 5	3 1	0 0	1 0	In one error case, the reviewer found the goal “live with other relative” instead of “long-term foster care.” In one error case, the case plan goal should have been “adoption” instead of “long-term foster care.” In one error case, the case plan goal should have been “reunification” instead of “long-term foster care.” In the Tribal error case, the AFCARS field was blank, and the reviewer found a goal of “adoption.”
#44 Caretaker Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female	55 4	5 2	0 0	4 0	In two error cases, the AFCARS data indicated “unable to determine,” but the reviewer found that the family structure was “single female.” In two error cases, the reviewer found that the family structure was “married

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
4 = Single Male 5 = Unable to Determine					couple” instead of a single female.” In one agency error case, the reviewer found a family structure of “single female” instead of “married couple.” In the Tribal error cases, the response was “unmarried couple” instead of “single female.”
#45 1 st Primary Caretaker's Birth Year	52 5	9 0	0 0	3 1	In six error cases, this element was reported blank when there was actually a date of birth found. In three error cases, the wrong date was reported to AFCARS.
#46 2 nd Primary Caretaker's Birth Year	54 4	8 2	0 0	2 0	In six error cases, this element was reported blank when there was actually a date of birth found. In one error case, the wrong year was reported. One error case was due to the reviewer’s finding for element #44. In the Tribal error case, the AFCARS data was missing, but the response to element #44 was “married couple.”

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					In the other Tribal error case, a date should have been reported because the reviewer found that the child was removed from an “unmarried couple.”
#47 Mother's Date of TPR	51 3	12 2	0 0	1 1	<p>In seven error cases, the reviewers found earlier dates than what was reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In four error cases, dates were found (AFCARS had missing data).</p> <p>In one error case, the child had been adopted prior to the current removal episode and the dates reported for TPR were those of the birth parents. The adoptive parents’ rights were not terminated.</p> <p>In one of the Tribal error case, the AFCARS data was missing, but the reviewer found a TPR date.</p> <p>In the other Tribal error case, the reviewer found an earlier date than the one reported to AFCARS.</p>

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#48 Father's Date of TPR	55 3	8 2	0 0	1 1	<p>In one error case, the wrong date was reported.</p> <p>In two error cases, dates were found (AFCARS had missing data).</p> <p>In one error case, the child had been adopted prior to the current removal episode and the dates reported for TPR were those of the birth parents. The adoptive parents' rights were not terminated.</p> <p>In three error cases, an earlier date was found.</p> <p>In one error case, the AFCARS information was blank, but the reviewer found a deceased date.</p> <p>In two of the Tribal error cases, the AFCARS data was missing, but the reviewer found a TPR date.</p>
#49 Foster Family Structure	56 6	7 0	1 0	0 0	<p>In one error case the response should have been "not applicable" instead of "married couple."</p> <p>In one error case, the response should</p>
0 = Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple					

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 71
Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male					<p>have been “single female” instead of “married couple.”</p> <p>In three error cases, the information was missing and it should have been “married couple.”</p> <p>In one error case, the response should have been “not applicable” instead of “single female.”</p> <p>One error case was due to element #41 being found to be incorrect.</p>
#50 1 st Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	55 5	8 0	1 0	1 1	<p>In three error cases, this information should have been zeros. Reviewer found that element #49 was “not applicable.”</p> <p>In one error case, a default year of 1800 was reported. Reviewer found actual birth year.</p> <p>In two error cases, the AFCARS data was blank, but the reviewer found a date.</p> <p>In one error case, this field should have been blank, or zeros, based on</p>

Number of cases in sample: 80
 Number of cases reviewed: 71
 Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					the finding for element #41. This element had a date. In one error case, the field should have been blank but “1111” was reported.
#51 2 nd Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	56 5	7 0	1 0	0 1	In two error cases, “0000” was reported, but the reviewer found 1940. In both cases, “married couple” was reported in element #49, and verified by the reviewer. In one error case, this information should have been zeros. In one error case, a default year of 1800 was reported. Reviewer found actual birth year. In one error case, the reviewer found a different year than the one reported. In two error cases, the AFCARS data was blank, but the reviewer found a date.
#52 1 st Foster Caretaker's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	60	8	1	1	In one error case the elements were blank, but in one the reviewer found that the race should have been “white.”

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 71
Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
b. Asian c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine					<p>In one error case, the response was “no” for “black or African American,” but the reviewer found it should have been “yes.”</p> <p>In one error case, the response was “yes” for “black or African American,” but the reviewer found it should have been “no.”</p> <p>The remaining errors were due to findings in elements #41 and/or #49.</p>
#53 1 st Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin	56 6	6 0	1	1	<p>In one error case, this element was blank, but the reviewer found the response was “no.”</p> <p>In two error cases, element #49 was a married couple and this information was blank.</p> <p>In two error cases, this information should not have been reported. The reviewer found that element #49 was “not applicable.”</p>
#54 2 nd Foster Caretaker's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	47 6	15 0	1	1	<p>In three error cases these elements were blank. In two cases, the reviewers found the race to be “black or African American.” In one case,</p>

Number of cases in sample: 80
 Number of cases reviewed: 71
 Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
b. Asian c. Black or African American d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander e. White f. Unable to Determine					<p>the race should have been “white.” In these cases, the response to element #49 was “married couple.”</p> <p>In one error case, the response should have been “yes” instead of “no” for “white.”</p> <p>In one error case, the response should have been “no” instead of “yes” for “unable to determine.”</p> <p>In one error case, the response should have been “no” instead of “yes” for “black.”</p> <p>In two error cases, the reviewer found “American Indian” as an additional race.</p> <p>In two error cases, element #49 was a married couple and this information was blank.</p> <p>In one error case, this information should not have been reported.</p>
#55 2 nd Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin	61 6	2 0	0 0	1 0	In the error cases, the response was missing but the reviewer found it

Number of cases in sample: 80
 Number of cases reviewed: 71
 Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					should have been “no.”
#56 Date of Discharge	62 6	2 0	0 0	0 0	In one error case, the response was missing but the reviewer found a discharge date.
#58 Reason for Discharge 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Reunification with Parent(s) or Primary Caretaker(s) 2 = Living with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Emancipation 5 = Guardianship 6 = Transfer to Another Agency 7 = Runaway 8 = Death of Child	63 5	1 1	0 0	0 0	In one error case the response should have been “runaway” instead of “not applicable.” In the Tribal error case, the reviewer found that the discharge reason should have been “reunification” instead of “transfer to another agency.”
#59 Title IV-E Foster Care	19	0	0	51	
#60 Title IV-E Adoption	23	0	0	47	
#61 Title IV-A AFDC	21	0	0	49	
#62 Title IV-D Child Support	23	0	0	47	
#63 Title XIX Medicaid	22	0	0	48	

Number of cases in sample: 80
Number of cases reviewed: 71
Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements
State: Oklahoma
Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006 (2006A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#64 SSI	21	2	0	47	
#65 None of the Above	23	0	0	47	
#66 Monthly Amount	21	2	0	47	

Number of cases in sample: 80
 Number of cases reviewed: 71
 Number of cases analyzed: 70

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements

State:

Report Period Under Review:

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#4 State Agency Involvement 1 = Yes 2 = No	30	0	0	0	
#5 Child Date of Birth	30	0	0	0	
#6 Child Sex 1 = Male 2 = Female	30	0	0	0	
#7 Child Race	30	0	0	0	
a. American Indian or Alaska Native					
b. Asian	30	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	30	0	0	0	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	30	0	0	0	
e. White	26	4	0	0	In three error cases, the reviewers identified this category as an additional race that applies. In one error case, the response should have been “no” instead of “yes.”
f. Unable to Determine	29	1	0	0	The response should have been “yes” instead of “no.”
#8 Child Hispanic Origin	29	1	0	0	The response should have been “yes”

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements

State:

Report Period Under Review:

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine					instead of “no.”
#9 Has Agency Determined Special Needs	30	0	0	0	
#10 Primary Basis for Determining Special Needs 0 = Not Applicable 1 = Racial/Original Background 2 = Age 3 = Membership in a Sibling Group 4 = Medical Conditions or Mental, Physical or Emotional Disabilities 5 = Other State defined	29	1	0	0	The reviewer identified “sibling group” as a primary basis instead of “other State defined.”
#11 Mental Retardation	29	1	0	0	This element was reported as “applies,” but the response to element #10 was “racial/original background.”
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	29	1	0	0	This element was reported as “applies,” but the response to element #10 was “sibling group.”
#13 Physically Disabled	30	0	0	0	
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	29	1	0	0	This element was reported as “applies,” but the response to element #10 was “racial/original background.”
#15 Other Diagnosed	30	0	0	0	

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements

State:

Report Period Under Review:

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
Condition					
#16 Mother's Birth Year	29	1	0	0	In one error case, the date reported to AFCARS was 2003. The reviewer found the actual year of birth was 1977.
#17 Father's Birth Year	25	4	0	1	In two of the error cases, the AFCARS file was blank, but the reviewer found dates. In one error case, the wrong date was reported. In one error case, the date reported to AFCARS was 2004. The reviewer found the actual year of birth was 1977.
#18 Mother Married at Time of Birth 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	17	12	0	1	In eleven of the error cases, "unable to determine" was reported to AFCARS. In one error case, the response should have been "yes" instead of "unable to determine."
#19 Date of Mother's TPR	26	4	0	0	In the error cases, the reviewers found earlier dates.
#20 Date of Father's TPR	22	6	0	2	In five of the error cases, the reviewers found earlier dates. In one error case, the reviewer found a later date.
#21 Date Adoption	29	1	0	0	The reviewer found an earlier date

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements

State:

Report Period Under Review:

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
Legalized					than what was reported to AFCARS.
#22 Adoptive Family Structure 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	30	0	0	0	
#23 Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	30	0	0	0	
#24 Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	30	0	0	0	
#25 Adoptive Mother's Race a. American Indian or Alaska Native	29	1	0	0	The reviewer found this category as an additional race.
b. Asian	30	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	30	0	0	0	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	30	0	0	0	
e. White	29	1	0	0	The reviewer found this category as an additional race.
f. Unable to Determine	30	0	0	0	
#26 Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin	28	2	0	0	The response should have been "no" instead of "unable to determine."
#27 Adoptive Father's Race	29	1	0	0	The reviewer found this category as an

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements

State:

Report Period Under Review:

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
a. American Indian or Alaska Native					additional race.
b. Asian	30	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	30	0	0	0	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	30	0	0	0	
e. White	29	1	0	0	The reviewer found this category as an additional race.
f. Unable to Determine	30	0	0	0	
#28 Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin	28	2	0	0	The response should have been "no" instead of "unable to determine."
#29 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Stepparent	30	0	0	0	
#30 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Relative	29	1	0	0	The response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." This was an additional relationship.
#31 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Foster Parent	16	14	0	0	The response should have been "applies" instead of "does not apply." This was an additional relationship.
#32 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Non-Relative	30	0	0	0	
#33 Child Was Placed from	30	0	0	0	

AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW CASE FILE FINDINGS: Adoption Date Elements

State:

Report Period Under Review:

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
1 = Within State 2 = Another State 3 = Another Country					
#34 Child Was Placed by 1 = Public Agency 2 = Private Agency 3 = Tribal Agency 4 = Independent Person 5 = Birth Parent	30	0	0	0	
#35 Receiving Monthly Subsidy	26	0	0	4	
#36 Monthly Amount	24	0	0	6	
#37 Adoption Assistance	0	0	0	30	